# 1NC Shell

The new climate bill in the Senate will solve multiple existential risks. It will pass, but Obama’s support is key. **Senator Sanders 2/16**[[1]](#footnote-1)

The issue that we are dealing with is not political. It has nothing to do with the squabbling we see in Washington every day. It has everything to do with physics. **The leading scientists in the world** who study climate change now **tell us** that their earlier projections were wrong. The crisis facing **our planet is much worse than they** had **thought only a few years ago**. Twelve out of the last 15 years ranked as the warmest on record in the United States. Now, scientists say that **our planet could be 8F warmer** or more by the end of **this century** if we take no decisive action to transform our energy system and cut greenhouse gas emissions. What would that mean to planet earth? **Sea levels would rise** by three to six feet, **which would flood cities** like New Orleans, Boston and Miami and coastal communities **all over the world.** It would mean that **every year** we **would see** more and **more extreme weather** disturbances, like Hurricanes Irene and Sandy, costing taxpayers tens of billions of dollars every year and resulting in **devastating** blows to **our economy** and productive capabilities. **We would see** the **price of food go up** because crops in the US and around the world would be affected by temperatures substantially greater than what we have today. **It would mean** greater threats of **war and international instability because hungry and thirsty people would** be **fight**ing **for** limited **resources. It would mean more disease** and unnecessary deaths. Legislation that I introduced(pdf) **with** the support of **leading environmental organizations** in the country can actually address the crisis and do what has to be done to protect the planet. **Senator** Barbara **Boxer** of California, chairman of the Senate environment and public works committee, **co-sponsored the bill that would reverse** greenhouse gas **emissions** in a significant way. **It** also **would** help **create millions of jobs as we transform** our energy system away from fossil fuel and **into** energy efficiency and such sustainably energies as **wind, solar,** geothermal **and biomass**. A major focus of this legislation is **a price on carbon** and methane emissions. This fee on the largest fossil-fuel polluters affects fewer than 3,000 entities nationwide but **covers 85% of** the greenhouse gas **emissions** in the US, **according to the Congressional Research Service. The legislation ends fossil fuel subsidies.** It also protects communities by requiring that drillers engaged in a new technology called fracking must comply with the Safe Drinking Water Act and disclose chemicals they use. To help consumers, 60% of the carbon fee revenue will be rebated to every US resident. To level the playing field for US manufacturers and create incentives for international cooperation, there would be a border fee on imported fuels and products unless the nation they were shipped from had a similar carbon price. To transform our energy system, the legislation would make the boldest ever investment in energy efficiency and sustainable energy. That includes weatherizing 1m homes a year, as President Obama has advocated. **It also means tripling the budget for** advanced **research** and investing hundreds of billions through incentives and a public-private Sustainable Technologies Fund focusing on energy efficiency and clean transportation technology, as well as solar, wind, geothermal and biomass alternatives. In our bill, we also provide funds to train workers for jobs in the sustainable energy economy and to help communities become resilient in the face of extreme weather. We accomplish all of this **while paying down the debt by** roughly **$300b[illio]n** over 10 years. **With** President **Obama's commitment in the state of the union** address to reverse global warming, **we have the opportunity now** to make progress. **The president** must use his executive authority to cut down on power plant pollution and reject the dangerous Keystone XL project. But he **must not give up on a** comprehensive **legislative solution**, and neither should we. We will never fully deal with this crisis until Congress passes strong legislation. **Senator Boxer and I are going** to fight as hard as we can to do that, and we will work **to rally support from** American **families** all across this country that care deeply about their children and grandchildren's future, and want **to protect them from this planetary crisis.**

Rehab kills Obama’s polcap. **Trinick 12** writes[[2]](#footnote-2)

Reasons why criminal justice policy is ignored 1) It’s politically toxic. **Any move** to alter the current tough stance on criminal justice **is** inevitably **viewed as** being **‘soft on crime’**, regardless of how much sense a new policy might make or how much it might reduce crime in the long-run. No politician, especially one running in a race as close as the current match-up, wants to be seen as ‘soft on crime’. For Republicans, “the party of law and order”, it would be sacrilege to even suggest a change in policy. For **Democrats, especially Obama,** the **aim** appears to be **to avoid looking “weak and liberal”** and avoid alienating middle-class white voters. In addition, it lacks appeal — few voters (read ‘people likely to vote in swing states’) care about the issue as they perceive that it does not affect them and it requires hard choices to be made. 2) People don’t like to have to think about it. This relates to the point above about having to make hard choices, but there is more to it. By its very nature, criminal justice is difficult and unpleasant to think about and so most people shy away from it — who wants to think about prison and criminals when there’s the new series of Homeland? The majority of people will have no interaction with the criminal justice system, especially not on the ‘wrong’ side of it, and so they shut their eyes, pretend they cannot see the problem and hope it will go away. The politicians and media know this and cater to the demands of their audiences. 3) **Changes would require the states and the Federal government to work together. This** shouldn’t be a deal-breaker, but it **adds more complexity** to an already difficult area. Both states and the federal government maintain prisons and any systematic attempt to reduce the prison population would require co-operation and negotiation between all the parties. In gridlocked Washington, this would be unlikely even if the topic was not so politically explosive. 4) Criminal justice policy is hard. Really hard. **What should be the moral basis** for imprisoning criminals — Deterrence? **Rehabilitation?** Proportionate punishment? Public protection? **Retribution?** Economic reality? Most countries follow a mix of these, but a different balance of the justifications can alter dramatically the policy pursued in a particular jurisdiction. Agreeing on **the** precise **balance is** something **fraught with** potential for **disagreement, even among** those who have no political concerns, like **academics.** On top of this, of course, is the fact that a different weighting of the justifications can have real cost implications — for example, both rehabilitation programmes and capital punishment are hugely expensive. 5) The overlap with drug policy does not help. Realistically the only way the USA is going to reduce its prison population by a meaningful amount is either to legalise (some) drugs or to impose far lighter (non-custodial) sentences for most drug related offences. While legalisation of (some) drugs may be a good idea, it is hardly an uncontroversial one and few, if any, politicians have the gumption, or the political capital, to take on both reform of the criminal justice system and drug legalisation.

# Uniqueness

## Will Pass

Obama will get climate legislation passed in the squo. **Murray 2/14**[[3]](#footnote-3)

Democrat Senator Barbara Boxer and independent Senator Bernie Sanders will today launch the latest attempt to pass comprehensive climate change legislation, just days after President **Obama used the State of the Union** address **to urge Congress to** act swiftly to **deliver a "bipartisan**, market-based **solution to climate change".** In a [statement on Senator Sanders' website](http://www.sanders.senate.gov/newsroom/news/?id=e20c6477-23dc-4a63-8fe9-e5b0c92d395b), he confirmed the two senators would hold a news conference later today to launch the bill, adding that under the legislation "a fee on carbon pollution emissions would [fund](http://www.businessgreen.com/bg/news/2243699/senators-to-debut-valentine-s-day-climate-change-bill) historic investments in energy efficiency and sustainable energy technologies such as wind, solar, geothermal and biomass". Significantly, the statement also confirmed that the proposals would "provide rebates to consumers to offset any efforts by oil, coal or gas companies to raise prices". **The Bill will have significant support from green groups,** with Sanders and Boxer slated to share a platform with Bill McKibben, founder of the 350.org group, Mike Brune, executive director of Sierra Club, and Tara McGuiness, executive director of the Center for American Progress Action Fund. It is also likely to secure support from numerous green businesses, **Democrat Senators and Congressmen,** the **Obama** administration, **and** potentially **a handful of Republicans.** McKibben, Brune, and other green campaigners are expected to attend following a protest outside the White House yesterday over the proposed Keystone XL tar sands pipeline that will see 50 people risk arrest. Precise details of the [new Bill](http://www.businessgreen.com/bg/news/2243699/senators-to-debut-valentine-s-day-climate-change-bill) are yet to be released, but there has been growing debate on Capitol Hill in recent months over the merits of using some form of carbon pricing mechanism to both curb greenhouse gas emissions and raise funds to tackle the US deficit. **Obama signalled that he is keen to see comprehensive climate** change **legislation pass** in his State of the Union address, **urging Congress to "pursue a** bipartisan, market-based **solution** to climate change, like the one John McCain and Joe Lieberman worked on together a few years ago" or face a series of presidential executive orders designed to accelerate cuts in greenhouse gas emissions.

## AT Thumpers

Climate change is Obama’s new focus. State of the Union and ILaw prove.

**Vargas 2/15**[[4]](#footnote-4)

In his 2013 **State of the Union** address, President Obama **highlighted climate change as a central priority** of his second term, dedicating 16 sentences to a topic his administration has largely kept out of the spotlight.

**Climate change now takes its place beside gun control and immigration** reform as policy challenges likely **to cost** Obama **significant political capital** in the years ahead. **Unlike those other** domestic **agendas, however, the U**nited **S**tates **has committed** itself **to an international timeframe** that calls for a global climate pact by 2015.

## AT Nat Gas/Energy

Energy rhetoric is all hype. Obama’s real focus is warming. **Vargas 2/15**[[5]](#footnote-5)

Following those remarks, **Obama** shifted to energy production, **touting** America’s ongoing **natural gas** boom as both an environmental and economic success. **For some**, that transition **was** a **worrisome** sign that climate change has been relegated in the President’s agenda to a spot of lesser importance than overtures to the fossil fuel lobby or the primacy of budget-cutting measures. MarketWatch’s Darrell Delamaide criticized this contextualization of climate change by saying that the President’s “call to action on climate change was bracketed by bragging about increased natural-gas production through hydraulic fracturing, a controversial method that environmentalists oppose because it releases vast amounts of the harmful greenhouse gas methane and does other damage to the environment.” David **Hunter viewed the remarks differently,** however, noting that Obama cannot escape the salient issues of Washington, even if he wants to elevate the standing of climate issues. “I think, politically, **when you’re talking against the backdrop of a fiscal crisis**, then **you have to justify every** government **expenditure in terms of money,**” Hunter said. “Do I think it’s unfortunate that we think about science and investment in science in those terms? Yes. Do I think **it’s politically wise given the** current fact that the backdrop of all these discussions is this recurrent fiscal and **debt discussion**? Yes.”

# Crime Turn

Climate change increases crime which turns the case. Studies prove. **Ranson 12[[6]](#footnote-6)**

This paper estimates the impact of climate change on the prevalence of criminal activity in the United States. The **analysis** is based on a panel of monthly crime, temperature, and precipitation data **for 2,972** U.S. **counties** over the 50-year period from 1960 to 2009. I identify the effect of weather on monthly crime by using a semi-parametric bin estimator and control- ling for county-by-month and county-by-year fixed effects. The results **show that temperature has a strong** positive **effect on criminal behavior**, with little evidence of lagged impacts. Under the IPCC's A1B climate scenario, **the U**nited **S**tates **will experience an additional 35,000 murders, 216,000** cases of **rape[s],** 1.6 million aggraved assaults, **2.4 million** simple **assaults**, 409,000 robberies, 3.1 million burglaries, 3.8 million cases of larceny, and 1.4 million cases of vehicle theft, **compared to** the total number of offenses that would have occurred between the years 2010 and 2099 in the **absence of climate change.** The present discounted value of the social costs of these climate-related crimes is between 20 and 68 billion dollars.
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